

the time of the men, and he swears he kept the time of the men and kept it accurately. He had his time book, which was produced before the committee shown as exhibit 23. That book was criticised most carefully. He was cross-examined at great length by Mr. McDougall on his time book. Every opportunity was given to show inaccuracies or falsification; and, after a thorough examination by Mr. McDougall of Mr. Pagé and his time book, the book was shown to be in every particular absolutely accurate—no suspicion of falsification in the book. He kept the time from day to day, and each week he supplied Mr. Champagne, the time-keeper, with a sheet showing the time of the men as he had kept it. These sheets were kept by Mr. Champagne until the work was completed and the account sent to Mr. Lanctot was made up from these sheets and from Mr. Pagé's time-book. Now, it is asked that the statement of Mr. Douaire should be accepted in preference to the statement of Mr. Pagé, that we are to believe that Mr. Douaire worked eight weeks and that, instead of keeping an account of eight weeks' time in his book, Mr. Pagé deliberately and fraudulently failed to keep account of Douaire's time, and in that way defrauded the government. I do not quite see how any person of fair mind can possibly reach such a conclusion. It can be easily imagined that Mr. Douaire is mistaken. He is not working continuously for the government. His evidence in that particular shows that for many days, and for weeks at a time, he was not working for the government but was laid off. It can easily be imagined that Mr. Douaire, in that matter, was mistaken. But we cannot reject the statement of Mr. Pagé without at the same time holding him responsible for perjury, for he deliberately says: There is my book; I kept the time from day to day; I marked it down each day in that book. He cannot be mistaken; either his statement is correct or he is deliberately perjuring himself. I will ask any hon. member which of these men he is prepared to believe. Are you going to say that the evidence of Mr. Douaire, who worked from time to time and who kept no record of his time—does not pretend that he did; admits that he did not—is to be taken against the evidence of Mr. Pagé, who did keep the time and kept it correctly. I should hardly think so; I should hardly think that any jury or any court would say that Mr. Douaire's evidence was to be accepted and that of Mr. Pagé rejected. The only man besides Mr. Douaire who says that he worked for a greater number of days than is shown by the time-book kept by Mr. Pagé is Mr. Louis Paul. There is a pecu-

Mr. GERMAN.

liarity in regard to Mr. Louis Paul's statement. At page 61 of the evidence is given exhibit No. 14, in which Mr. Paul states that he worked 30 days or one month. It is shown in the evidence by Henri Proulx, who is called as a witness, that Louis Paul gave him this statement in which he says:

I declare that I have worked at Mr. Lanctot's house for one month, paid for at the government.

On the time-book, Mr. Louis Paul is down as having worked 20 days at \$2 a day. When that statement was placed before the committee I unhesitatingly, and with the approval of all the members of the committee, ruled that the statement was not evidence, it was only marked for identification, with the expectation that Mr. Louis Paul would be called as a witness to verify the statement himself. I submit that that statement should not have been offered as an exhibit in this evidence, and it should not be considered, because it is certainly not evidence of any kind. There was no opportunity to cross-examine Louis Paul, this is his bald statement, not even made to the committee, but given to an outsider who is called as a witness. He says he worked thirty days, and even applying the same rule that you apply to Mr. Douaire and Mr. Pagé, where does it land us? Supposing Louis Paul had been there and made that statement; 'I worked for thirty days,' he kept no accurate account of it, he kept no account of any kind. Mr. Pagé did keep an account, and says he kept it correctly. I submit that the evidence of Mr. Pagé, on these matters should be accepted, rather than the evidence of Douaire, or the evidence of Louis Paul, even though that evidence were admissible, which it is not. Those are the only two witnesses called who say they worked a longer time than is shown in the time-book kept by Pagé. Well it appears to me that the committee would be doing a wrong thing to doubt the evidence of Pagé, who appears to be an eminently respectable man, and a highly intelligent man, who was not shown to be in any way personally connected with the matter, who states frankly, and above board, what his connection with the matter was, with an apparent desire to tell the truth, apparently having been desirous of keeping a correct account of the time of all these men. I say we should not place the statements of these men who kept no time as against the statement by Mr. Pagé, and as I say, those are the only two who were called, the only evidence there is of any time having been worked which was not charged for.

But it is said that the work did not cost nearly as much to Mr. Lanctot as it was